



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

JJGJR.: 06-06

Paper No: \_\_

APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.  
2881 SCOTT BLVD. M/S 2061  
SANTA CLARA CA 95050

**COPY MAILED**

JUN 19 2006

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of	:	
Mukai,et al.	:	
Application No. 09/910,583	:	DECISION
Filing Date: 20 July, 2001	:	
Attorney Docket No.: 5047	:	

This is a decision on the petition filed on 24 April, 2006, alleging unintentional delay under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).

For the reasons set forth below, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **GRANTED**.

**BACKGROUND**

The record reflects that:

- Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the non-final Office action mailed on 3 December, 2004, with reply due absent extension of time on or before 3 March, 2005;
- 7 April, 2005, Petitioner filed with a request and fee for extension of time a reply in the form of an amendment, which was found informal and a Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment was mailed on 25 April, 2005, with a reply due on or before 25 May, 2005
- the instant application went abandoned after midnight 25 May, 2005;
- the Office mailed a Notice of Abandonment on 30 March, 2006;

- on 24 April, 2006, Petitioner filed the instant (with fee), reply in the form of an amendment and made the statement of unintentional delay—thus, Petitioner appears to have satisfied the requirements of a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).

In light of the period from the date of abandonment after midnight 25 May, 2005, until the filing of the instant petition on 24 April, 2006, Petitioner is cautioned as to the appearance of the use of the former one-year limitation on abandonment as an unauthorized extension of time.

### STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).<sup>1</sup>

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.<sup>2</sup>

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.<sup>3</sup> Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).<sup>4</sup> And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.<sup>5</sup> Failure to do so does not

---

<sup>1</sup> 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

**35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.**

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

<sup>2</sup> Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

<sup>3</sup> See: *Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice*, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

<sup>4</sup> See: *In re Application of G*, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

<sup>5</sup> See: *Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment*, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office supra.

constitute the care required under Pratt,<sup>6</sup> and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

(By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.<sup>7</sup>)

As to the Allegation  
of Unintentional Delay

The requirements for a grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee, a statement/showing of unintentional delay, a proper reply, and—where appropriate--a terminal disclaimer and fee.

It appears that Petitioner has satisfied the requirements of the regulation.

The record (including the petition filed on 24 April 2006) does not necessitate a finding that the delay between midnight 25 May, 2005 (date of abandonment), and 24 April, 2006 (date of filing of grantable petition), was not unintentional.

Rather, the Patent and Trademark Office is relying in this matter on the duty of candor and good faith of Applicants (Mukai and Chandran) and their Counsel/Petitioner (Michael A. Bernadicou (Reg. No. 35,934)) when accepting Petitioners' representation that the delay in filing the response was unintentional.<sup>8</sup>

CONCLUSION

The petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) hereby is granted.

The instant application is released to Technology Center 1700 for further processing in due course.

---

<sup>6</sup> The test of diligence in the prosecution of an application before the Commissioner is, in the context of ordinary human affairs, the test is such care as is generally used and observed by prudent and careful persons in relation to their most important business. Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31 (Comm'r Pat. 1887); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (Comm'r. Pat. 1913).

<sup>7</sup> Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

<sup>8</sup> See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing the statement required by 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) to the Patent and Trademark Office).

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214.



John J. Gillon, Jr.  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions